

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated May 16, 2006. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11, 13-15, 34-42, and 52-27 are pending. Claims 9, 11, 13, 15, 34, 36, 39, 41, 52 and 53 have been amended. Support for the claim changes can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added. Claims 9, 13, 34 and 39 are in independent form.

In the final Office Action dated May 16, 2006, Claims 9-11, 13-15, 34-42 and 52-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,034,970 (*Levac et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,925,595 (*Whitledge et al.*).

The independent claims are believed allowable over the art cited in the May 16, 2006 Office Action for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, “a deletion unit adapted to delete registered character strings from the new text detected by said detection unit in order to avoid converting the registered character strings into synthetic speech, wherein the registered character strings are the same as character strings registered in a predetermined file.” Each of independent Claims 13, 34 and 39 includes an identical or similar recitation.

Regarding *Levac et al.*, the Office Action (page 4) states “Levac fails to disclose deleting character strings from a web page based upon character strings registered in a predetermined file.” *Levac et al.* is not understood to teach or suggest the above-noted recitation of independent Claim 9.

Whitledge et al. relates to a method and system for content conversion of hypertext data using data mining. However, nothing in *Whitledge et al.* is understood to teach or suggest the above-noted recitation of independent Claim 9.

In regard to the deletion unit of Claim 9 (as that claim stood prior to the instant Amendment), the Office Action (pages 4-5) cited col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 10, lines 33-44; and Table 1, col. 11 of *Whitledge et al.*

Col. 8, lines 5-13 of *Whitledge et al.* refer, e.g., to consulting a database to obtain conversion preferences. However, nothing in this portion of *Whitledge et al.* is seen to teach or suggest registered character strings (from new text inserted in a web page, detected by a detection unit) being the same as character strings registered in a predetermined file (or other aspects of the above-noted recitation of independent Claim 9). Nothing in this portion of *Whitledge et al.* is seen to teach or suggest the above-noted recitation of independent Claim 9.

It is noted that nothing in col. 10, lines 33-44 of *Whitledge et al.* mentions or suggests “deleting” or other aspects of the above-noted recitation of independent Claim 9. Nothing in this portion of *Whitledge et al.* is seen to teach or suggest the above-noted recitation of independent Claim 9.

Regarding Table 1, col. 11 of *Whitledge et al.*, even if this portion of *Whitledge et al.* is deemed to show a delete process or capability, nothing therein is understood to teach or suggest other aspects of the above-noted recitation of independent Claim 9. Nothing in this portion of *Whitledge et al.* is seen to teach or suggest the above-noted recitation of independent Claim 9.

No other portion of *Whitledge et al.* is understood to teach or suggest the above-noted recitation of independent Claim 9.

Since neither *Levac et al.* nor *Whitledge et al.* is understood to contain all of the elements of independent Claim 9, that claim is believed allowable over those documents. Since each of independent Claims 13, 34 and 39 includes elements identical or similar to those of Claim 9, those claims are also believed allowable over those documents.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. These claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas W. Pinsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,994

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DWP/km

DC_MAIN 257039v1